UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 13-329 51
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCELLING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Caulos Rodhiguer -Vasquer Defendant.	MAY 2 9 2013
	CLERKUS. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA May 49, 2013, the Court excludes time under the
Speedy Trial Act from May 19, 2013 to July	ne 4, 2013 and finds that the ends of justice served bublic and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would be See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the proor law, that it is unreasonable to expect	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial d by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 5/24/13	JOSEPH C. SPERO
	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Volume	
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney